

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & ENERGY  
of the  
Suffolk County Legislature  
Minutes**

A regular meeting of the Economic Development & Energy Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **May 3, 2001**.

**Members Present:**

Legislator Jon Cooper - Chairman  
Legislator Andrew Crecca - Vice-Chairman  
Legislator Martin Haley - Member  
Legislator Ginny Fields - Member

**Also In Attendance:**

Paul Sabatino - Counsel to the Legislature  
Gerard McCreight - Aide to Legislator Cooper  
Linda Bay - Aide to Presiding Officer Tonna  
Todd Johnson - County Executive's Office  
Gordian Raacke - CAP  
Colleen Cuff - Suffolk County Community College  
Alice Amrhein - Commissioner of Economic Development  
George Proios - County Executive Environmental Director

**Minutes Taken By:**

Patricia Patriss - Court Stenographer

---

(\*The meeting was called to order at 2:50 P.M.\*)

**CHAIRMAN COOPER:**

I'd like to welcome everyone to the May 3rd meeting of the Economic Development & Education -- & Energy Committee, I'm sorry. Legislator Fields, if you could lead us in the Pledge, please.

**Salutation**

We have one speaker on the agenda, Gordian Raacke. If you can come up please, Gordian. All the members of the committee should have received a copy of Citizens Advisory Panel's quarterly report to the Suffolk County Legislature. And Gordian is here to discuss the report and to see if we have any questions. Gordian, would you like to get started?

**MR. RAACKE:**

Sure. Thank you. Good afternoon and you should have before you as the Chairman said, the first quarterly report for this year. It actually has a typo. It says April 2001 at the top. It should say

May since this is obviously May now. I had submitted a draft copy in April that's how that happened.

The issues you find in here are the kind of issues we've been working on for the last few months. They're not necessary a complete list of all the issues. What I did is I picked some of the issues that I figured would be of interest to you and gave a brief description of each. Of course you're welcome to ask me any additional questions you may have on this either today or as a follow-up I'd be happy to provide more backup information on this.

I just wanted to highlight some of the issues that may be of interest. I'm not going to time here to go into a great length of detail on all of this. But on the financial issues I think the most important development was that LIPA -- at its March meeting the LIPA Board of Trustees voted to add a fuel, what they call a fuel surcharge of five point eight percent to electric rates. I think many people have felt that it's not -- no matter what the semantics are, that it's not -- a surcharge really is a rate increase. This is important from a legal perspective possibly because under the public authority's control board conditions that were imposed by the State as part of a takeover, and were accepted by LIPA as part of its deal.

One condition of PACB says that -- very clearly states that any rate increase in excess of two and a half percent require the full evidentiary hearing before the Public Service Commission. The reason way a full evidentiary hearing or rate case is important is that that is a quasi judicial proceeding where groups like ours or the Legislature, anybody can go in and question LIPA's assumptions, pass fiscal assumptions, put LIPA's witness on the witness stand, examine them under oath and request full documentation of all these issues. We have not had that opportunity. We've not had the opportunity for example to see whether LIPA has done everything to cut costs to offset the increases in fuel and purchase power costs.

---

LEG. HALEY:

May I interrupt, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Please.

LEG. HALEY:

You said it was okay to interrupt you when you went along. We've been talking about this increase for along time. You've brought it up ever time you've come here. How come I don't see any ground swell of

opposition to that? I mean, I don't seem to read about it. I don't see anybody out there making a big stink out of it. Even though we may agree with you that that rate increase is inappropriate.

MR. RAACKE:

I don't know. I can't answer that question. You know, that's maybe the media, maybe the public perception out there. Maybe their perception -- you know, a lot of people tell me, you know, what are you going to do? I mean, you know, LIPA is LIPA. They're going to do whatever they want to do and there's not much we can do about that. So maybe it's that. I really don't know the answer to that.

LEG. HALEY:

So LIPA's position is obviously that they can do it.

MR. RAACKE:

Well, LIPA was not legally challenged. This was not, you know, this was not challenged in court. So if they get away with it, they get away with it, and of course that tells them something.

The --

LEG. HALEY:

Thank you.

MR. RAACKE:

The fuel cost increase is continuing of course. At the LIPA Board of Trustee meetings just two nights ago there was much discussion about a continued increase in rise in fuel and purchase power cost and there was some concern there among the trustees that LIPA may even have to increase its rates once again this year despite the promise that the five point eight increase would be it for this year.

The Chairman was not in agreement there, but some of the trustees felt we that, hey, you know, we may just have to do it. We may just have to renege in our promise once again. They're definitely very concerned about that and I would agree of course.

The authority has also issued or is planning to issue about five hundred million dollars worth of additional bonds this year. They've already issued the first or are in the process I should say of issuing the first set of three hundred million dollars in debt and that's of concern because it appears that they are going deeper and deeper into debt. The amount of interest payments is rising and they seem to be funding not just capital projects with additional debt. So did the Nassau County approach the things I guess to, you know, just keep

borrowing more money to run the day-to-day operations.

We also, in going through the budget we had a number of other issues that we found of concern. One is that the 2001 budget is based on a fairly optimistic sales forecast. Of course, if that does not materialize, then financial conditions are possibly going to be even more difficult. There's also, you know, some concerns regarding employee compensation. LIPA is planning to have seventy-three employees at the LIPA headquarters. That's not of course, counting the KeySpan employees under contract LIPA. The total compensation salary and benefits for those seventy-three employees are seven point seven million dollars. That comes to a hundred and five -- on average a hundred five thousand dollars per employee, plus eighteen thousand dollars in additional expense. A hundred and twenty-three thousand dollars for the average employee raised somewhat of a red flag here.

Let me go on unless you have any particular questions on that, to B, the Resource Planning Issues starting on Page 5. The Power Authority has the option in year three of the -- beginning in year three of the takeover to purchase KeySpan's existing plants. That starts on June 1st of this year and ends on May -- in May of 2002, that option.

The question that would have to be asked I think would be number one, does it make sense to buy -- to spend money on purchasing the existing KeySpan plan since they are largely very old and outdated plans. Does it make sense for rate payers to invest a lot of money in this old clunker technology if you will? Wouldn't it make more sense to invest in cleaner state-of-the-art technology?

There's also a question about timing. This is a time of increase and demand and short supply. That's pretty bad timing if you want to buy a power plant. That means, you know, obviously prices for power plants on the Island in the capacity constrained regions are going to be up, experiencing upward pressure.

There's a third issue which --

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Gordian, excuse me, if I can interrupt for a second. Are there any areas in the north east where there has -- there's a greater reliance on solar energy, and if there are, could you elaborate a little bit and let me know what the approach is taken by the local energy providers there, and how it differs from LIPA?

MR. RAACKE:

Yeah, there are some utilities, especially in California, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District that has made a much more aggressive effort on siting solar panels, solar electric panels within its service territory. In fact, they had a nuclear power plant that they shut down over there, and they shut that down for similar situations here on Long Island. They shut that down and then began to run a very aggressive solar pioneer's program.

They're being cited as the example for forward looking utility all over the County when it comes to alternative resources. They also run some very, very aggressive demand site management programs.

---

LIPA on the other hand, and I have some more on that later on there, but in a nutshell LIPA has been focusing when it comes to its energy, its clean energy initiative has been focusing mainly on two things. One is PR, running advertising, you know, improving corporate image, making the power authority look green and clean if you will, and also focusing on peak shifting programs rather than energy conservation programs. In fact, some of the money spent on -- previously spent on energy efficiency improvements are now being shifted to just move energy usage from one part of the day to another in the summer. And while that's not a bad thing it just means that we're not focusing on what really conserves energy, what really produces energy consumption overall.

LEG. CRECCA:

You know, before you even go on, just to interrupt, Mr. Chairman, just because on that point there, when you say a lot of it's being spent on PR though, but isn't that for conservation efforts? I mean, because I've seen a lot of the LIPA ads regarding conservation, telling people about the use of energy efficient appliances. I mean, those are the ads that I've seen. The light bulbs, the -- you know, I've seen a lot of that. I also know that -- I mean, we just -- they approved the Green Parks Program over in Blydenburgh County Park, which actually is going to be kicked off in the next couple of weeks, where they're footing the bill for the County for the entire electric fleet and appliances there, you know, somewhere in the tune of between eighty and a hundred thousand dollars.

So I mean, I know those are small potatoes compared to the whole thirty-two million dollar fund, but you've made some blanket statements, basically saying that the money is not going toward conservation. Do you have anything, number one, to back that up, and number two, and I'm not here to defend LIPA, but you know, that's a pretty damning statement that you're setting forth. And I know some of the money they're spending there. I've worked with them and they've done some good things and I don't hear anything of that being acknowledged.

MR. RAACKE:

Absolutely. Let me make that clear. They're doing some very good, they're running some very good programs and they're spending some serious money on some of those programs. I'm just saying that the tendency seems to be that program money is being shifted from energy efficiency programs towards peak shifting program and also there seems to be a greater emphasis on promotional and advertising expenditures rather than rebate and incentives. And the problem with that is --

LEG. CRECCA:

Well -- go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. RAACKE:

Okay. The problem with that is that, you know, people may through these ads may learn about the availability of certain products, but when they go into the store and find that, the more efficient refrigerator costs a lot more than the energy hog refrigerator,

---

despite that knowledge they may end up voting with their pocketbook and buy the more wasteful appliance. If you don't provide the rebate, all the advertising, all the knowledge, all the educational components might not do the trick.

So it's a question of the right balance between informational programs and rebate and incentive programs.

LEG. CRECCA:

All right, but you've made -- you've set forth a proposition that much of the thirty-two -- I think it's thirty-two million. I shouldn't say that. Is that what it is?

MR. RAACKE:

Thirty-two plus another five now.

LEG. CRECCA:

But you've made an accusation that much of that money in general terms is going towards nonenergy conservation efforts. Do you have anything specific for us to back up that claim? Because I'd want to hear that. The mean, the bottom line is, is that, you know, you talked about the energy efficient appliances. I mean, I know we traded in two lamps, you know, for nothing, for more energy efficient and safer lamps from LIPA recently, at a thing that they did at the local malls and things like that. And certainly that costs them money. That was funded out of the clean air initiative. I'm just using that as a consumer thing.

So I guess my question is, is you keep saying the same thing, but I'm asking you, what do you have to back that up? Do you have a list of ads that they've put, and how much that's cost them, or have you looked at the thirty-two million? I'll defer to Legislative Counsel. You know, it's one thing to make a general accusation, but I'm saying, but you know, if you're going to make those than back them up to us. That's all I'm saying.

LEG. HALEY:

Well, that's somewhat consistent. I was thinking, sitting here while Gordian was going through everything. And for instance when we put together an advisory committee for the Chandler Estate I asked them to put things in the form of a point counterpoint, which says that, you know, in the interest of educating us that we understand both sides of

it, and not that anything that you said is not true or anything like that. What maybe perhaps we should ask -- maybe we should ask LIPA to send representatives and in fact ask questions. You know, perhaps they can answer this.

I mean we could go on for literally days right now talking about these various points such as the purchase of a power plants where you make a statement that it appears as though they're willing to pay market value for those plants where there is in fact a PACB resolution that states that they can't pay more than book value. Do you know for a fact that LIPA plans paying market value for them?

MR. RAACKE:

Well, this is the -- I'm glad you're mentioning that. That's the problem that I'm seeing there, which is that they're really between a

---

rock and a hard place in that the agreement that they signed with KeySpan, the agreement of plan of merger. The takeover agreement says that they have the option to purchase at fair market value. The agreement that they accepted or the conditions that they accepted from the PACB on the other hand says that they cannot pay more than book value, which of course is a huge difference, and cannot be reconciled at this -- at least not at this stage.

LEG. HALEY:

Does your report --

MR. RAACKE:

I don't know how they're going to get out of that bind.

LEG. HALEY:

Okay. Because I just read through that real quickly. Does your report talk about -- does it make that statement that they have in fact an agreement to buy it for market value with KeySpan?

MR. RAACKE:

Yeah, if you look on Page 6, it says in 1998 LIPA accepted the condition from the State Public Authority's Control Board to pay no more than book value,

LEG. HALEY:

Right, but is there a statement in here where they've made an agreement with KeySpan to buy things at market value?

MR. RAACKE:

Yes. Well, that's -- I'm not sure where it is in here, but that's the -- according to the agreement and plan of merger that is the language



that they agreed to which is fair market value.

LEG. HALEY:

All right. I don't see that in here. I'm just curious. And that just goes -- that's why I'm thinking, you know, when we all supported you know, funding to continue this oversight, which I think it's extremely important, but oversight I think needs to be from a point counterpoint. And in absence of that I think it's incumbent upon us to ask LIPA, of course with you in attendance, to make some sort of a presentation so we can get the counterpoint on some of these things.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Gordian, would you be up to going head to head against Richard Kessel at the next meeting?

MR. RAACKE:

I'd love that. We've done that many times in the past. So just to make clear here what I'm hearing. You're asking me to, when I present the next report to represent the LIPA perspective and the --

LEG. HALEY:

I'm unfamiliar with our specific agreement with you so I'm not going to -- I'd like to see that, but in absence of counterpoint, I think we need to provide counterpoint, either in the form of changing our relationship with you or to ask LIPA to attend. So I don't really

---

have a thought either way.

MR. RAACKE:

And I don't have a problem with that. I'm just -- I'm asking for some direction. I mean, what I can do in the next report is lay out the varying position on this.

LEG. HALEY:

Well, Counsel, we have a contractual agreement I imagine. How do we affect a change like that?

MR. SABATINO:

You've raised a good point, an important one quite frankly, which is that the way the contract is structured it's really for this committee. This is the committee under the contract that has been given the secondary oversight function, which is to basically give direction, supervision to the consultant in terms of what you want to see take place in terms of the general oversight of LIPA. So what really should happen, we tried this last year with the old energy committee, is that after some kind of a presentation by CAP you should really narrow down what areas as a committee what areas of LIPA you



wish to see, you know, CAP prepare some kind of a follow-up, an analysis, is there some kind of proceeding you want to bring to give some focus and some direction to what you want to see actually happen.

So the short answer to your question is this committee could direct what you've just suggested as one of those areas to look into. But I would just recommend that you try to narrow it down to like what topic because what he's giving today is like a overview of all the issues that are out there. But what's missing, what needs to be done, is the committee has to just then say this is what's important to us in Suffolk County. This is what we'd like to see happen and give them some direction, otherwise it starts to kind of free float which undermines the purpose of the contract and the funding which is to get some real focused oversight.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

But to address the point that you raised Legislator Haley, I don't know whether it's really fair to ask Gordian to make the case for LIPA or for the other side. And even if he attempted to, I don't know whether that would fully satisfy you. It may be appropriate to ask LIPA whether they would like to send a representative to some of these future meetings.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah, I mean, I agree. What I would like to do is -- and I would ask for the committee's input on this and of course the Chair, maybe is forward a copy of this quarterly report to the Long Island Power Authority and ask them if they would be willing to come and just address it in general. Not in a confrontational way, but just so they can come in and say, you know, we agree with Mr. Raacke on X, Y and Z, you know, and then, but we disagree with them on X, Y, and Z and this is why. And that would, I think, enable us Marty, to say to Gordian, okay, you know what, we want you to look into these areas, you know what I mean, cause I think LIPA is right about this, but I think they're wrong about that, and we would like to follow up on that. It

---

might give us a little more direction too, and it would also certainly give us a better perspective, I think.

LEG. HALEY:

I -- actually I would think in the matter of cover letter perhaps we could ask them initially to just address those areas as to statement of facts that he's represented all right. And then so that we have the facts and then they can make a representation as to the facts as they see them and then we can narrow it down to something. Because you know can happen is we could wind up spending literally days and

days and days going through minutiae, which I'd like to avoid.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

That's a great idea. Okay, Gordian, please continue.

MR. RAACKE:

Okay. So in any case, just to state that again for the record, the agreement and plan of merger states that LIPA has the option to purchase at the fair market value, purchase the KeySpan plants at fair market value beginning in year three for a one year time period. And the PACB condition states that LIPA can spend no more than book value on these plans. And that's important because, you know, ratepayers have already paid for those plans. The remaining value is called book value. So if you pay anymore than book value you're in effect paying again for the same assets.

The next item I had highlighted was a proposal by LIPA, actually a tariff now that's in affect now. It's been dubbed the dirty little diesel tariff. I'm sure LIPA would again disagree here with that characterization. They call it the Supplemental Service Tariff. This is a tariff that was designed very differently from what other utilities are doing and what the New York Independent System Operator is doing. It provides incentives for commercial customers with backup generators through a specific tariff. And they must agree to run their backup generators for at least eight hours a day for five days a week during the summer.

This has raised considerable concern. The health impacts of diesel generators are well documented. They're quite dirty. That's why their called dirty little diesels. And not -- this tariff does not distinguish between the technology. It just says backup generator. Many of the existing generators and many of the new generators that commercial operators may be buying would be diesel generators.

There are some clean technologies available too, but this tariff does not reward the cleaner technology and provide a stake approach to the dirtier one. You have some more of the detail in here. I don't have to elaborate on that, but it's been very surprising to see that LIPA took that position.

We met -- I met with them with several other people and we found out that this was not just designed to provide sort of a you know, emergency safety feature in case of a brown out or black out situation. That would be, you know, you would say okay, if we can keep the lights on no matter how, let's do it. This would be in their perspective, according to LIPA representatives the way to bring

additional generation capacity onto the Island. But the question it raises is that do we really want new capacity that's that dirty, that's in some cases a hundred times more polluting than conventional gas pipe generation.

The LIPA clean energy initiative, Legislator Crecca had already asked me to provide a lit bit more detail here, and I should also say I'm preparing a detailed request for information to LIPA to provide some of accounting of these program monies and how that was spent. So that's in process, but maybe one area that we should look at is the -- LIPA's own study from a few years back in 1991, LIPA had a very well respected research outfit produce a study as to how much energy we could be saving with energy efficiency technologies on the Island and the number back then was four hundred and forty-one megawatts within the decade. The size of a you know, midsized, good sized power plant I guess.

The -- I remember a press release and a press conference with the Chairman back then praising this report and saying this is what LILCO should be doing and this can be done, this can be done in very cost effective -- with very cost effective programs. We're -- you know, we shouldn't be wasting so much money on fossil fuel generation. This is what we should be doing and we can cost effectively save four hundred and forty megawatts of power with these kind of technologies.

Now that LIPA is the utility however, the goals have changed pretty dramatically. This year their programs are supposed to save a hundred and twenty-nine megawatts of capacity and only twenty-nine megawatts of that comes from energy efficiency programs. The rest is peek shifting programs. So that's why I'm somewhat skeptical and somewhat disappointed with the programs. And again, let me make clear that I'm not saying that whatever they're doing is bad policy or bad programs. Some of these programs are very good and in fact I went out and bought some compact fluorescent light bulbs for my home and they had a LIPA rebate of six dollars on it and I thought that was great.

On the power plant proposals I think --

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Gordian, I'm sorry. Before we leave this, if this information is accurate it's very disconcerting. I won't ask if you have any idea as to why this change in outlook has taken place at LIPA but are there any practical steps that could be taken by the Legislature or some other body to address this.

MR. RAACKE:

Well, the Legislature and the County could of course take a proactive approach on this and not just wait for LIPA to come up with good programs and good policies, but take a first step. I mean, the County of course owns a great number of facilities where somebody could take a look and see what we could do to conserve energy and in these facilities and this is a good example here. This is actually, from what I can see here, I haven't looked at any blueprints, but from what I see here, a very good facility in terms of energy use with energy efficient lighting and so on, but you know, I'm sure there are many other opportunities for the County to not only save money, but also

---

help cut down on electric energy use and peak usage and thereby help avoid potential brownouts and blackouts. That's something you all could take a very proactive role in, in cooperation with LIPA.

I should also mention on this study, on this four hundred and forty megawatt study, LIPA -- we had brought this to LIPA's attention last year and LIPA had announced that they're doing a new study, a new integrated resource study or alternative resource study. That -- the results of that -- and work had begun. In fact, I had seen some statement of work on that and so on. That study has never been completed to the best of my knowledge, has never been made public. So LIPA has never taken a position on this. They've never said well this old study is just old and not valid anymore, neither have they come up with a new set of numbers that says well, you know, we think we can do this much. They're just running their programs and they're setting certain goals, but it's not within the context of any, you know, the larger picture.

LEG. HALEY:

They only have seventy-three people.

MR. RAACKE:

True. Now, they do have a few thousand over at KeySpan that actually do most of the work, and those people are some very experienced utility people and experts.

Anyhow, on the power plant proposals you of course know that there are a number of over twenty or so power projects being studied for interconnection studies. I gave you an updated list here that we prepared excerpting information from the New York ISO study. That's the last -- that's attachment A, the last couple of pages in the package.

One thing to always make clear is that not all of these plants and projects are going to be built. These are merely requests for studies for interconnections with the New York Independent system operators. So you know, don't -- it's not -- I can't emphasize enough that I don't think we're ever going to see all these plants built. These are just in the planning stages here. There are also a couple of new developments here that are not yet reflected or part not reflected in this chart. One is the NYPA plant of course in Brentwood part of an eleven plant project that the New York Power Authority is implementing. It ran into a lot of criticism among other things for the fact that most of these forty-four megawatt generators were located in rather poor neighborhoods.

They did not do a full environmental justice analysis and a lot of people have said, you know, how come when it comes to building a power plant in Southampton LIPA quickly scraps those plans and builds a

transmission line to Riverhead, but when NYPA looks at potential sites for power plants they choose some pretty disadvantaged communities without ever doing a full environmental justice analysis. It's been a -- you know, I know from some colleagues in the city it's a big concern there.

But this -- and then -- I'm sorry. Then there's the what's not

---

reflected on this chart yet is a plan you may have heard about to site a five hundred megawatt power plant and combined cycle plant on a fifty acre parcel at Calverton.

LEG. HALEY:  
Combined cycle?

MR. RAACKE:  
I'm sorry?

LEG. HALEY:  
Combined cycle?

MR. RAACKE:  
Combined cycle, yes.

LEG. HALEY:  
I don't know what that is.

MR. RAACKE:  
Combined cycle is technology where you use the -- you have to turbine just like in a single site hole, you know a gas turbine, like an airplane engine basically. That turns the generator making electricity and then exhaust heat from that is used to heat water, generate steam, and that steam turns the secondary generator. So you're getting more energy out of the same amount of fuel. It has less waste. It's a better technology than what's being proposed PP&L in Kings Parks for example, because you get more kilowatt hours out of the same amount of fuel.

LEG. HALEY:  
Everything we're talking about here is gas, right?

MR. RAACKE:  
Yeah. They're gas turbines. They can be run on fuel as -- on distillate fuel as well. Typically they built them in a dual fuel mode so they can switch from gas to oil.

This sort of is a segue to the fact of the -- what I think is the

unfortunate fact that we really don't have any serious comprehensive energy planning process at the moment. The Article 10 process really does not look at this in a comprehensive way. It really just looks at each application, each power plant application individually. It does not ask the question is this proposal better than that proposal? Is combined cycle technology proposed for Calverton by AES better than the simple cycle proposed by PP&L in Kings Park. It doesn't do that. It doesn't look at need. It doesn't ask the question do we need five hundred megawatts of additional power or fifteen hundred megawatts. It just looks at it, you know, by application.

LEG. HALEY:

What do you think we need?

MR. RAACKE:

I think we need a -- I think the first step is we need a comprehensive planning process. We need to look at the whole island. Ascertain how

---

much energy we're going to need and then find out what kind of option we have --

LEG. HALEY:

Do you think -- are you willing to say that we need additional energy but you're not sure how much?

MR. RAACKE:

Absolutely. Yes. I couldn't -- I mean, offhand I couldn't say how much. That's a resource study you have to do in a forecast, but I'm sure -- I mean, we're seeing an increase in demand. I'm sure we're going to need additional power. The question is how are we going to meet that? What kind of options do we have to meet that, and what are the best options to meet that? And I'm going to get to that in a moment. On the repowering issue I wanted to say a couple of things on that. But again, I think that --

LEG. HALEY:

I want to interrupt again. I'm sorry. Because you're -- I know from a global perspective we'd like to be able to address all of those issues and get things right down, but it seems that if we can get to a point at which we can somewhat agree on the increase capacity that we need and that we -- if we understand -- if you were to say five hundred and they were to say fifteen hundred megawatts and we could get people to agree on five hundred and then we can say, all right, we know all of the other issues that you've brought forth, you know, let's agree for now that we got to go move forward and site five hundred megawatts and making a concerted effort together to site five hundred megawatts instead of trying to, you know, worry about all the

global issues.

I mean, the major issues to us is whether or not we want to deal with gas plants, combined plants, combination plants, whatever you call them. You know, I understand that from a policy perspective, but the reality is we need five hundred megawatts. Let's figure out how to get them sited .

Calverton happens to be a great place to site it, but you have transmission. But all of those things should -- that should be considered. Something -- you know what I'm thinking about Gordian, I'm thinking about obtainable goals because we keep -- you know, this whole thing is masked with, you know, LIPA, we still can't trust them and you know, we have all of this competition out there and we got fifteen hundred megawatt -- what does that add up to by the way, these proposals?

MR. RAACKE:

I don't have the number handy now. It was somewhere around four thousand -- it would almost double our current capacity. But again, this is --

LEG. HALEY:

Right. So -- you know, but that's obvious when you -- you know, it's like when we go out and we acquire open space. You know, we over do it by a hundred percent. You know, we only have about a forty to fifty percent success rate. So, you know, maybe that's an approach,

---

you know, they go out and they site what they can, but if it's consistent with transmission and distribution capabilities, then I can understand that because you're not going to get every siting you request.

MR. RAACKE:

What you see on that list though is not -- this is not the result of some sort of planning process. This is merely the result of developer A coming in to Long Island saying oh, there's an area that has high electric rates and is experiencing growth and demand. I think I can make a lot of money there if I get --

LEG. HALEY:

Well, that's okay too, right?

MR. RAACKE:

Sorry?

LEG. HALEY:



That's okay too, right?

MR. RAACKE:

Sure. No problem with that, and then developer B comes in and says the same thing and says I think could make a lot of money too.

LEG. HALEY:

Because I'm talking about a -- because we kind of put the responsibility on LIPA to ultimately provide us power although independent companies can come in and do that. If they want to come in and give us four thousand and we can site it, four thousand megawatts God bless them. Then you know what, guess what's going to happen to our rates. You know, something is going to give. So I don't have a problem with that providing we could site things. That's our biggest problem is siting them, right?

MR. RAACKE:

Siting, yeah siting is --

LEG. HALEY:

Well, that's what I mean. That's all part of the whole process. If you want to put a site in your neighborhood, you're not only concerned about the NIMBYism, but you're concerned about, you know, all the emissions and all the -- I mean, all of that is considered. That's why actually most of it should be out like in Montauk because of the prevailing westerlies. You know, we don't have to worry about polluting the air at all on the Island. I mean, we buy all the open space out there, right, from the east end. Let Peconic County have all the sites.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Yeah, who's the Montauk Legislator?

LEG. HALEY:

Legislator Guldi.

---

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Yeah, I vote for that.

LEG. HALEY:

Okay.

MR. RAACKE:

Well, you know, they're are a number of other issues of course, and it's not just sitings, but -- and community acceptance, but that is

definitely a big problem. There are transmission constraints, you know, you have to look at availability of gas, availability of the transmission lines. So it's, you know, it's a combination --

LEG. HALEY:

Tongue in cheek, I understand.

MR. RAACKE:

It's a complex issue. But anyways, I think what we're getting at here is that somehow we need to come to a resolution of this problem and that's why I'm saying I think that it would be good to have a comprehensive plan because to put all this together because right now there's a very fragmented approach. LIPA up to this point didn't really want to get involved in the siting process and in the planning process for power plants because they know politically it's a, you know, it's a hot issue.

LEG. HALEY:

I can't blame them.

MR. RAACKE:

I've seen some -- a little bit of change in attitude there from the Chairman in that he has said I think we need to at least take partial responsibility and we're going to look at some options and they may make an announcement soon on a couple of plans. I hear that they're looking at an addition at the Barrett facility in Nassau County, a rather -- you know six hundred megawatt or something like that, addition. And also at the Spagnoli Road Site again, a two hundred and fifty megawatt addition I believe. That's not official yet. But that's --

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Gordian, is there an example that you can provide of a County or municipality where they have taken, have developed a long-term comprehensive approach to an energy plan where they're doing it right that we can look to as a model here or is this all pie in the sky?

MR. RAACKE:

I have to look. I'm not --

LEG. HALEY:

I don't think you can. You know why, because there's a whole big change nationally in an approach to energy where there's the, you know, the private sector is participating. So we're in that flux. You know, everything's starting to develop. We're talking about one entity, but yet we're talking about, you know, there's a whole lot of other private enterprise out there trying to generate energy too. So

you know, it's complicated.

MR. RAACKE:

To some degree -- I mean, with deregulation, with the introduction of competition we sort of threw out the blueprint or the planning approach and said well, somehow you know, we're going to let the market take care of that. The developers are somehow going to figure this out, and we'll have enough power, we'll have enough power plants being built and let them worry about it. It depends on where you stand on that debate as to you know, free market forces in electricity versus other planning approaches.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Legislator Fields.

LEG. FIELDS:

Gordian, on Page 23, I don't know if you've gotten to that, but it's sort of in --

LEG. HALEY:

You're reading ahead.

LEG. FIELDS:

It's the same kind of thing that we're talking about at the moment where LIPA has this Long Island Choice Program to allow the customers to buy electricity from someone other than LIPA, and you indicate that KeySpan sells to residential customers, but that when they agree to sign up -- I'm trying to -- there was a number that they suggested originally that they were going to try to sign up, correct, or did they not originally?

MR. RAACKE:

Number of customers --

LEG. FIELDS:

Not KeySpan, but --

MR. RAACKE:

Number of customers you mean?

LEG. FIELDS:

New customers to use other --

MR. RAACKE:

Yes. Yeah.

LEG. FIELDS:

But they have fallen very short of that number?

MR. RAACKE:

Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:

Have they indicated why or --

---

MR. RAACKE:

I'm not sure what they cited as the reason. I can tell you what I think the reason is. The reason I think is simply that LIPA's add on charge, you can buy the energy somewhere else, but LIPA is still delivering it to your door, through your outlet so to speak, and they're charged for that. That charge is not just a delivery charge that incorporates the cost of maintaining the wires. That charge includes the Shoreham -- that charge included billions of dollars that we ended up paying for the Shoreham regulatory asset. And therefore, the savings are rather minimal. The -- what you will save by shopping around for a different supplier of the raw energy is minimal because you have such a huge amount of additional costs slapped on by LIPA for the recovery of the Shoreham regulatory asset and therefore many people say it's not worth it.

The Power Authority gives you about three point cents credit if you buy your electricity somewhere else you're going to have to find power for less than three point nine cents and that's tough. I mean, if you find it for three point eight cents you're going to save very little. Maybe for some larger outfits it makes sense, but for most residential customers it's like it's hardly worth the trouble they feel.

I wanted to just briefly speak about the repowering issues since we've talked about the need for additional generation possibly. That's one area that I think should be -- definitely be explored. The existing -- many of the existing power plants on Long Island are very old and very inefficient and polluting. An obvious solution to cleaning them up and at the same time providing additional capacity would be to repower those units. The Northport Unit for example, the Port Jefferson unit and so on.

There are several repowering projects underway, many actually, across the Country and several in New York State, and I've looked into that to some extent. The closest one is the Orion Power Project. They're planning to add about five hundred megawatts to the Astoria Plant in Queens. They're doing that in phases and they're also replacing the existing very old and polluting units. And when you look at that you know, you see that you can kill two birds with one stone.

You can provide the additional capacity, the additional power and you can -- it will result in cleaner air and less pollution because in that case the displacement argument -- the displacement argument is the argument that many of the other power plant developers are now making, which is that you know, our new plant is going to be cleaner running than the old plants. The problem with that is that you may not see the old plant retired as the new plants come up. You may end up seeing both of them running at the same time. Then you have no net benefit in terms of the air pollution. You have a net increase in air pollution. Whereas, here you're replacing the old and polluting unit that you cannot run. There's no way the old unit could run while

the new unit runs because you've replaced them. You've build on that foundation.

The costs for that are in some cases very competitive. The cost estimates I've heard is about a million dollar megawatt. In Orion's case actually they're planning on spending only four hundred thousand

---

dollars in megawatts. It depends on the site conditions of course it depends. The people I've talked said, you know, it depends on whether you have asbestos in the old plant you have to remove. That's expensive, more expensive and so on. It depends on the particular sites, but there's some more information about that in the report here that may be of interest.

I've also put some information in on the existing Shoreham site. There obviously is the possibility of constructing a new facility, power facility there. You've heard of course that the proposed three hundred thirty megawatt transmission cable from Connecticut ran into a roadblock when the Connecticut siting counsel voted to reject that. I don't know what the outcome of that's going to be eventually, but that would mean if that cable does not get hooked up at Shoreham, that at a minimum a three hundred and thirty megawatt plant could be constructed there because the transmission facilities out of Shoreham to the rest of the Island do exist.

You would however, have to find a way to get natural gas there. There are a couple proposals right now. One from KeySpan and one from a Tennessee company to build a natural gas pipeline terminating at Shoreham. And again, that's so -- there's more information in here on Page 17 and so on.

I also briefly wanted to inform you of the fact that a wind, an actual wind study is being initiated in Europe. That's been very successful. A lot of offshore wind turbines were erected there. They're planning to have several thousand megawatts of wind capacity off the shores of Denmark, the Netherland and the UK soon. It's worthwhile looking at that. LIPA and NYSERDA and BNL are undertaking a study to look at that potential off the shores of Long Island.

Maybe I can skip over the environmental issue, the climate change issue. Not that it's not important, but I don't want to take up too much of your time here. I'd be happy to answer any questions of course on that issue as well as the other issues.

And then maybe just to go all the way to the back of the document now, the last item in the miscellaneous category is the New York

Independent System Operator. The ISO is sort of the new entity that regulates the exchange of power and power flow in New York State. It used to be the New York Power Pool. The ISO consists of a number of representatives on the Management and Business Committee. Government groups can have representation there and I would suggest that the County Legislator take a look at possibly being represented there. Some very important decisions are being made there and of course it would be important to be able to affect those decisions.

To give you one example price caps, you know, in summer month you may be seeing some very volatile price spikes in power prices. There have been proposals and in part they're enacted and part not, to cap that to say the price of power on the open market is not allowed to go over a certain limit. That of course has a tremendous affect on what we end up paying for power. They're are pros and cons on that issue, but the point I wanted is that it may be worthwhile to seek representation on that body.

---

And with that I welcome any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Legislator Fields, any questions? All right. Gordian, thank you very much for presenting a very comprehensive report. You've raised a number of important and very interesting issues. And I'm sure if the members of the -- yes, I'm sorry.

MR. RAACKE:

I forgot one issue that's not in the report that I wanted to just bring to your attention. It just become an issue at the -- or I become aware of this issue two days ago at the LIPA Trustee Meeting. It's something I think that should be on your radar screen, which is that the nine mile units, the nuclear reactors upstate in Oswego County in which we have an eighteen percent share, LIPA took over the -- bought the eighteen percent share from LILCO in the nine mile point two reactor. Unfortunately bought that share at an outrageously high price. Six hundred and eighty-four million dollars we spend for that share.

Those units are being sold right now. All the other utilities are selling. These were regulated New York State utilities. NYMO and others are selling to an unregulated entity called Constellation Nuclear, which was spun off from Baltimore Gas and Electric. LIPA is not selling its share. LIPA is the only entity retaining its share. That raises a number of issues. In fact, raised some questions with some of the LIPA trustees two nights ago. The issue being what happens if there's a problem? Are we going to be left holding the

bag?

We are the only entity in this arrangement that has any real assets. Constellation Nuclear has no real assets other than another nuclear power plant, the Calvert Cliffs Facility and also it's forming a limited liability corporation. The question that of course comes up is what if there was a problem of whatever sort would we be the ones bailing out the remaining eighty-two percent share?

Also there are certain agreements being negotiated now and being signed by LIPA. Despite the fact that they're not selling, they are signing an operating agreement with that new entity and planning to sign several other agreements. And it looked to me as if rate payer's interests are not terribly well protected there and I would ask for your permission to investigate that further.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Please, if you could. I'd appreciate that.

LEG. CRECCA:

I can't find Marty.

MR. RAACKE:

Do you want me to be available for further questions?

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Yes, just in case, please.

---

LEG. HALEY:

Sorry.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Legislator Haley, do you know the issue before us?

LEG. HALEY:

No, I don't.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Were you listening?

LEG. HALEY:

I was, but --

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Gordian, do you want to just briefly recap?



MR. RAACKE:

Sure. This is on the nine mile nuclear reactor upstate New York. As you know we have an eighteen percent share in that nine mile point two reactor, and two nights ago the -- two days ago the Power Authority announced that it will not sell its share in that reactor while all the other utilities are -- the other New York State utilities, regulated New York State utilities are selling their share to an entity called Constellation Nuclear, which is an off-spin of Baltimore Gas and Electric.

I did a little bit of background checking on them. They will not have any substantial assets other than their nuclear plant Calvert Cliffs, that they own. This raises a number of issues, one of them being a liability issue. If LIPA is the only entity that has any real assets, if there was a problem of whatever kind would we be the ones left holding the bag? Would we be, you know, in fact responsible for not only our share but, you know, more than that? And I also, LIPA is signing or entering or planning to enter into a number of agreements, operating agreements and several other agreements regarding that transaction. And it appears that the agreements are structured in a way that do not aggressively represent and protect ratepayers interest. So I was suggesting that's something I should take a look at and come back to you and report on that further.

LEG. HALEY:

We need to know what the liabilities are.

LEG. FIELDS:

His question was do we want him to research this for us.

LEG. CRECCA:

I just wanted to ask him -- I didn't even know why that's why I was coming in, so I apologize. Now LIPA owns -- do you know what percentage they own of the plant?

MR. RAACKE:

Eighteen percent of unit two. We bought -- I should mention --

---

LEG. CRECCA:

And what -- I'm sorry. And I just want to focus in on the issue, and I apologize it's my own ignorance, but the eighteen percent, we own eighteen percent. Now what are you saying is going to happen, this Baltimore Company is --

MR. RAACKE:

The own eighteen percent, the ownership of both units -- I'm sorry.

The ownership of Unit 1 was entirely within Niagara Mohawk, an upstate utility. Ownership of Unit 2 was split among a number of other utilities in New York State including LILCO. LILCO owned an eighteen percent share of that. We took over that ownership as part of the takeover of LIPA, LIPA's takeover of LILCO. We ended up paying six hundred and eighty-four million dollars for that eighteen percent share. And just as an aside, that eighteen -- or similar, these eighteen percent shares are now going for about ninety million dollars only. At the time I was very critical of paying such a high price for that eighteen percent share, but that's, you know, that's past now, that's history. But we still own that share and under this arrangement LIPA is not selling its share. LIPA is keeping its share.

LEG. CRECCA:

But everybody else is selling it, is that what you're -- is that the point, to this Baltimore company?

MR. RAACKE:

Yes. And the Baltimore company has basically no real secure assets other than another nuclear plant, which raises the issue of liability being a joint owner with an entity that may not be able to cover or fully cover its liability, which raises concerns.

LEG. CRECCA:

Question for Counsel, if you can answer it. The liability, assuming there was liability, would it be joint and several in the sense of that LIPA would be as responsible or would their liability be limited to their eighteen percent share? I should be able to answer this, but I just --

MR. SABATINO:

I believe it's joint and severable, but I don't know that to be a fact because I don't know the details of the agreements. That would be one of the things that would be important to get from a fact-finding standpoint to see what the potential is.

LEG. HALEY:

Why don't we make the suggestion that we just get the facts.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah, okay.

LEG. HALEY:

Yeah, I'm in support of getting the facts.

LEG. CRECCA:

Getting the facts. Not a deep investigative --

LEG. FIELDS:

That what he's asking you.

LEG. CRECCA:

Right. Yes. I'm saying to my fellow Legislators why don't you just get the facts. Let's not go into an expansive investigation, but if you could gather the facts for us and present those facts to us, I think that would be a good idea. Is that a clear enough --

LEG. HALEY:

With a sufficient technical relationship so that we can review that from a legal perspective.

MR. SABATINO:

Yeah, I think it's important -- it should be limited to a fact-finding mission as opposed to conclusions, or taking a position. It should be left to the Legislature then to evaluate those facts and then decide whether it wished to pursue some option or formulate an official position. So, to me it will be a narrow instruction, a mandate just to do fact-finding.

LEG. FIELDS:

May I ask, do we know why they don't want to sell their share?

MR. RAACKE:

I have no idea.

LEG. FIELDS:

That might be --

MR. RAACKE:

That's the first question to ask in the fact-finding mission.

LEG. FIELDS:

That might be something that we might want directly.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Hopefully we'll have a representative of LIPA at the next meeting. We'll have the opportunity --

LEG. FIELDS:

That's what I'm saying. I just said that.

MR. RAACKE:

You know, one kink in the fact-finding will be that the agreements are probably not available. As they're being drawn up now I would imagine that the parties would not release the agreements. They're not completed yet, they're not executed yet. So we'll have to --

LEG. HALEY:

That's to date.

MR. RAACKE:

We'll have to work with what we'll be able to get. But I'll submit that to you as soon as I can.

---

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Okay. Thank you Gordian. There being no further speakers we can move to the agenda.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 2286-00 (P) - Adopting Local Law to Require Power Plant Emission Evaluations (Fisher).

LEG. HALEY:

Table.

LEG. CRECCA:

I just have a question. I'll second for the purpose of discussion. Question, are we going to be doing any -- having any speakers on this or getting any further information? I've read the bill, I just haven't gotten a lot of detail on it, and it sounds like something I would certainly want experts to weigh in on given it does certainly have a lot of technical aspects to it.

.

MR. SABATINO:

Mr. Chairman, the public hearing has been recessed because the sponsor is working on a corrected copy. So it's recessed to make changes.

LEG. CRECCA:

That more than answers my question. Sorry. Second on the motion to table.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

All those in favor? Opposed? Resolution is tabled (Vote: 4-0-0-0).

IR 2321-00 (P) - Adopting Phoenix Financial Recovery Program for Long Island (Binder).

LEG. CRECCA:

Can we get an explanation on this? I did read it also, but --

MR. SABATINO:

This is Legislator Binder's proposal to deal with the Judge Gowan's decision by going to Nassau County and offering a hundred million dollar payment --

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Motion to table.

LEG. HALEY:

Second.

LEG. CRECCA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

All those in favor? Opposed? Resolution is tabled (Vote: 4-0-0-0).

---

LEG. CRECCA:

That was much to lengthy of explanation from Counsel. I'm just teasing.

IR 1027-01 (P) - Directing County Department of Economic Development to Implement Accounting Requirement for the Downtown Revitalization Program (Caracciolo).

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Why was this tabled?

LEG. CRECCA:

I thought we did this already, didn't we on the floor?

MR. SABATINO:

No, it's been discussed I think two or three times. The last committee meeting what was explained and it was tabled for a different reasons, but what was explained was that it was going to track the kind of reporting requirements for the downtown revitalization monies that are currently in place for the public safety revenue sharing funds. And I forget which Legislator at the committee said, you know, can't that just be done administratively and based on that comment being made by a Legislator and the answer being yes it could be, it was tabled.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Motion to table.

LEG. FIELDS:

Second.

LEG. HALEY:

Just table it subject to call.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah, motion to -- I'm going to make a motion to table subject to call.

LEG. FIELDS:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

I second that motion. All those in favor? All those opposed?  
Resolution is tabled subject to call (Vote: 4-0-0-0).

Sense 137-2000 (P) - Memorializing Resolution Requesting LIPA to Bury  
all existing and future overhead utility lines serving the North Fork  
and Shelter Island (Caracciolo).

LEG. FIELDS:  
Motion to table.

LEG. HALEY:  
Second.

---

CHAIRMAN COOPER:  
All those in favor? Opposed? Resolution is tabled (Vote: 4-0-0-0).

LEG. HALEY:  
Although, you know, it might be a good idea if we make sure they bury  
--

LEG. FIELDS:  
All.

LEG. HALEY:  
No. They did that on the North Fork. Do you have any idea what  
that's going to cost those rate payers?

LEG. CRECCA:  
I know. That's what I was going to say.

LEG. HALEY:  
As long as they extend those -- I'm willing to vote for this as long  
as it's -- if it's just extended to those residents in that area then  
it's not a problem for me, you know. I mean, do you have any idea  
what that would cost?

LEG. FIELDS:  
Yes, I actually had some information on how much it costs and it's  
extremely expensive. In Southampton they buried seventy-two million  
dollars for something like seven miles.

LEG. HALEY:  
Yeah, it's crazy.

MR. SABATINO:  
I thought I heard twenty million, but I know it's in the millions. I

mean --

LEG. CRECCA:

Southampton can afford it though, I would think, right.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

I'm sorry was that resolution -- did we vote on tabling?

LEG. HALEY:

We tabled it, yeah.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Okay. Thank you. Sense 10-2001 (P) - Memorializing Resolution Requesting State of New York to Ensure Equitable Representation in Long Island Power Authority Board Leadership and Requesting Nassau County to Help Fund Consumer Protection (Haley).

LEG. HALEY:

I'd like to move that out now.

LEG. CRECCA:

Sure. I'll second that. I think we're all cosponsors on that bill.

---

LEG. FIELDS:

Yes, we are. All those in favor? Opposed? Sense is approved (Vote: 4-0-0-0).

#### Introductory Resolution

IR 1357-01 (P) - Establishing Climate Protection Greenhouse Emission Program for Suffolk County (Cooper). Before we entertain a motion, George, would you mind coming up and just speaking about this resolution a bit?

MR. PROIOS:

Hi.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Thank you, George.

MR. PROIOS:

George Proios from the County Exec's Office. I've been trying to gather some information about the organization that's sponsoring this. It's a large organization with several very large websites I found out, but it's called the International Council for Local Environmental



Initiatives. It has more than three hundred local Government participants worldwide in this Country. In the U.S. there's seventy-eight cities and counties that are members of the organization.

Its primary goal is to reduce greenhouse gases which are primarily carbon dioxide and methane, by undertaking energy audits municipalities and towns and counties and cities and seeing where this is any waste and by reducing that waste, thereby reducing the amount of Co2 emissions going into the atmosphere. And you can do that through a variety of different ways, some of which we've heard of, some which I was very surprised that I'd never heard of.

One that stood out was traffic lights. I don't believe anybody here has ever seen an analysis of how many traffic lights we have and how much energy they use, but apparently there are new LEDs, Liquid Emitting Diodes that are red that has almost a ninety percent reduction in energy costs. So by replacing the incandescent bulbs in traffic lights you have a substantial reduction in energy usage. And several cities have now begun to do this and there have been pay backs between two and three years, and as far as maintenance costs, there's six times less maintenance involved, and so overall you end up saving a tremendous amount of money.

They offer assistance by providing an intern to the Counties or townships that requested they pay for intern so that we'd probably have to change, I think, the resolution there just to make it clear that we would not be having to pay for it. They pay for it themselves. But there is a charge of four hundred and seventy-five dollars to purchase some specific software that it's licensed. And so maybe that should also be included in the resolution so it's clear where the money would come from to pay for that software.

---

LEG. CRECCA:

Can we make those changes and pass this out of committee, Counsel?  
Is that possible?

MR. PROIOS:

I was going to also add that there was a number of other questions we had. Primarily, with respect to the intern, who does the intern exactly work for, us or for them? And who has the final sign-off on the plan? Do we write off or can the intern produce a plan and then submit it to them without our okay? We were trying to find out who funds the organizations and --

MR. JOHNSON:

Just make a request to table it.

MR. PROIOS:

Yeah, that's what I was leading up to. We had a number of questions that we wanted to see if we could clarify. So if we could table it for just two weeks, I can get those answers and I was told that the intern probably wasn't going to start before the first week in June. So we could still probably still put this all together if there were no problems.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

All right. We have a commitment from the County Exec's Office that we'll have those answers before the next meeting.

MR. PROIOS:

I just wanted to give you an -- if you had any questions too, so what I'm looking --

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

I'll make a motion to table the resolution.

LEG. CRECCA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Thank you, very much, George. All those in favor? Opposed. Resolution is tabled (Vote: 4-0-0-0).

#### Sense Resolutions

Sense 29-01 (P) - Memorializing Resolution Requesting State of New York to Repeal Gross Receipts Tax on Energy on Energy. (Caracciolo).

LEG. HALEY:

Motion.

LEG. CRECCA:

Motion to what?

LEG. HALEY:

Approve.

---

LEG. CRECCA:

You just said motion. I just was checking.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Explanation.

MR. SABATINO:

This is Legislation that's asking the State of New York to fully repeal the gross receipts tax on energy because it's currently been abolished only for large manufacturers. This would extend it to small businesses, commercials, and a partial break for homeowners.

LEG. CRECCA:

I'll second that motion to approve then.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

All those in favor? Opposed? Resolution is approved (Vote: 4-0-0-0).  
Meeting is adjourned.

(\*The Meeting was adjourned at 3:57 P.M.\*)

Legislator Jon Cooper, Chairman

Economic Development & Energy Committee